FILED FOR DOCKEN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS OL JUN 24 PM 1: 45 EASTERN DIVISION JUN 2 4 2004

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOLGENCORP., INC., a Kentucky Corp.,

Defendant.

040 4233

No.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

JUDGE RONALD GUZMAN

MAGISTRATE JUDGE LEVIN

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

TO: Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Lee D. Sarkin Matanky and Matanky, Ltd. 1332 N. Halsted St., Ste 300 Chicago, IL 60622

Clerk of the Court Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois Richard J. Daley Center 50 West Washington Chicago, IL 60602

Defendant, DOLGENCORP., INC. ("Dolgencorp"), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1332, 1441, and 1446, hereby provides notice of removal of this action from the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois to this Court. The grounds for removal are as follows:

1. On May 25, 2004, Dolgencorp's registered agent was served with a Summons and Complaint filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois in an action entitled *Orchard Park*

Š

Plaza, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company vs. Dolgencorp., Inc., Case Number 04 CH 08268. A copy of Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

- 2. Dolgencorp files this Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 for the reasons that there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and the amount in controversy is alleged to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.
- 3. The Plaintiff, Orchard Park Plaza, L.L.C., is incorporated in Illinois, according to the Complaint.
- 4. The Defendant is incorporated in Kentucky. It has its principal place of business in Goodlettsville, Tennessee.
- 5. Because Plaintiff is an Illinois resident and the Defendant is a Kentucky or Tennessee resident, there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1). Attached as Exhibit B is an affidavit attesting to Defendant's diversity of citizenship.
- 6. Plaintiff's Complaint seeks damages of over \$150,000 plus injunctive relief. Accordingly, the amount in controversy exceeds the \$75,000 (exclusive of interest and costs) jurisdictional requirement of 28 U.S.C. §1332(a).
- 7. This Notice of Removal is timely because it was filed within thirty days of service of Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint upon Defendant.
- 8. Dolgencorp has provided written notice of the filing of this Notice of Removal to all attorneys of record and to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

Case 1:04-cv-04233 Document 1 Filed 06/24/04 Page 3 of 17

Dated: June 24, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant Dolgencorp, Inc.

#28
J. Patrick Herald
Ethan A. Berghoff
Hillary P. Krantz
One Prudential Plaza
130 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
Tel. (312) 861-8000
Fax. (312) 861-2899

CHIDMS1/414685.1

	t Served ved By Mail ved By Publication	2121 - Served 2221 - Not Serve 2321 - Served B 2421 - Served B ALIAS - SUMMO	y Mail y Publication		((Rev.12/3/01) CCG 0001		
		E CIRCUIT COUP DEPARTMENT, _C		COUNTY, IL	LINOIS DIVISI	ON		
	(Name all parties)			No	. <u>04c</u>	408268		
ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, L.L.C., an Illino liability company,			imited	PLEAS	PLEASE SERVE DEFENDANT BY SERVING:			
DOLG	ENCORP., INC., a Kei	v. ntucky corp.		208	ORPORATION S. LaSalle ago, IL 606	St., 8th Floor		
To each de	efendant:	S	UMMONS	REC	eived !	MAY 2 5 2004		
hereto atta						case, a copy of which is the Clerk of this Court a		
3	Richard J. Daley Cent	er, 50 W. Washingto	on, Room		_, Chicago,	Illinois 60602		
ם	District 2 - Skokie 5600 Old Orchard Rd. Skokie, IL 60077	.	District 3 - R 2121 Euclid Rolling Mead	olling Meadov iows, IL 6000	District 4 - Maywood 1500 Maybrook Ave. Maywood, IL 60153			
a	District 5 - Bridgeview 10220 S. 76th Ave. Bridgeview, IL 60455	a	District 6 - M 16501 S. Ked Markham, II	zie Pkwy.				
IF YOU F.	file within 30 days after AIL TO DO SO, A JUD TED IN THE COMPI	GMENT BY DEFA				YOU FOR THE RELIE		
To the offi	cer:		,					
endorseme		if any, immediatel	ficer or other y after service	. If service o	cannot be n	s given for service, with nade, this summons shal		
Atty. No.:			WIT	NESS,	- potto?	1.2404WN		
Name: Lee	D. Sarkin/Matanky an	d Matanky, Ltd.			CLERR ST	Property of the ball of the same		

Name: Lee D. Sarkin/Matanky and Matanky, Ltd.

Atty, for: Plaintiff

Address: 1332 N. Halsted St., Ste. 300

City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60622

Telephone: (312) 337-6100

Service by Facsimile Transmission will be accepted at:

(Area Code) (Facsimile Telephone Number)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF	COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	

Contract Con

ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company,)
Plaintiff,)))
vs.) No.
DOLGENCORP, INC., a Kentucky corp.,	} 0 4CH08268
Defendant.) ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

NOW COMES, Orchard Park Plaza, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company, ("Plaintiff"), by and through its attorneys, Matanky and Matanky, Ltd., and for its Verified Complaint against Dolgencorp, Inc. ("Defendant"), states as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff is an Illinois limited liability company.
- 2. Defendant is a Kentucky corporation with its principal place of business in Scottsville, Kentucky.
- 3. Plaintiff owns commercial real estate commonly referred to as Orchard Park Plaza Shopping Center, 80-138 S. Orchard Drive, Park Forest, Illinois (the "Premises").
- 4. The parties entered into a lease dated January 14, 1999 (the "Dollar General Lease"), whereby Plaintiff leased 9,800 square feet of the Premises to Defendant. A true and correct copy of the Dollar General Lease is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
 - 5. Defendant operates a retail store doing business as Dollar General at the Premises.

The Grocery Anchor

6. The anchor tenant of the Premises is Sterk's Super Foods ("Sterks") grocery store.

ξ.

- 7. There has been a Grocery Anchor at the Premises since September 15, 1964, when Jewel Tea Company, Inc. ("Jewel") executed a lease for the Premises (the "Jewel Lease"). A true and correct copy of the Jewel Lease, as amended, is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".
- 8. A memorandum of the Jewel Lease was recorded with the Recorder of Deeds of Cook County, Illinois on October 14, 1964 as Document No. 19273619.
 - 9. The Jewel Lease preceded the Dollar General Lease by over 34 years.
- 10. The Jewel Lease was in full force and effect on January 14, 1999 when the parties entered into the Dollar General Lease.
- 11. Article 43 of the Jewel Lease granted Jewel the exclusive right to operate a food supermarket and drugstore on the Premises.
- 12. The Jewel Lease expired on May 21, 2000 and Jewel vacated the Premises and ceased being the Grocery Anchor at the shopping center.
- 13. On January 25, 2000, Plaintiff signed a lease with Sterk's operating company (the "Sterk's Lease"), to re-tenant the space that Jewel was going to vacate upon expiration of the Jewel Lease. A true and correct copy of the Sterk's Lease is attached hereto as Exhibit "C".
- 14. Sterk's acquired possession of and presently occupies approximately 56,000 square feet at the Premises pursuant to the Sterk's Lease and is the Grocery Anchor for the shopping center.
- 15. Article 7.6 of the Sterk's Lease, like the Jewel lease, granted Sterk's the exclusive right to operate a supermarket on the Premises.
- 16. Pursuant to Article 7.6 of the Sterk's Lease, Plaintiff, as landlord, agreed that no other tenant at the Premises would "operate a supermarket, grocery store or convenience food store, or any other store which sells food for consumption off of the Premises (except for a fast

food or drive thru operation)."

The Dollar General Lease

- 17. On or about January 19, 1999, the Plaintiff and the Defendant entered into the Dollar General Lease.
- 18. On or about May 19, 2003, before Defendant installed refrigerators or freezers and began marketing refrigerated and/or frozen foods, it extended the term of the Dollar General Lease through January 31, 2007. A copy of the letter confirming the Defendant's request to extend the term of the Dollar General Lease is attached hereto as Exhibit "D".
 - 19. No other provisions of the Dollar General Lease were altered.
- 20. Article II of the Dollar General Lease permits Dollar General to "use the demised premises for the retail sale of general merchandise of the type sold in other Dollar General® Stores".
- 21. Upon information and belief, the general merchandise of the type sold in other Dollar General Stores at the time the parties entered into the Dollar General Lease (January, 1999) did not include food items such as produce and other frozen and/or refrigerated items.
- 22. Pursuant to Article XXVIII of the Dollar General Lease, the parties acknowledged and agreed that: (a) a "Grocery Anchor" was the anchor tenant at the Premises; (b) the Grocery Anchor occupied at least 35,000 square feet at the Premises; (c) the Grocery Anchor's lease was non-cancelable during the term thereof; (d) Plaintiff would not consent to cancellation of the Grocery Lease during the term of the Dollar General Lease; and, (e) if the Grocery Anchor closed its business operation to the public during the term or any renewal of the Dollar General Lease, Defendant could, at its option, cancel the Dollar General Lease within 365 days thereafter,

without further liability to Plaintiff.

- 23. Pursuant to Article XXIX, Paragraph q, the defendant covenanted and agreed to abide by the rules and regulations of the Shopping Center.
- 24. Attached to the Dollar General Lease as Exhibit "E" is a list of Rules and Regulations for the Shopping Center.
- 25. Pursuant to Rule and Regulation E contained within Exhibit "E" to the Lease, the defendant agreed to refrain from doing or permitting to be done, anything in or about the Premises which will in any way obstruct or interfere with the rights of other tenants or occupants of the building of which the Premises may be a part or any other building in the Shopping Center, or injure or annoy them, or use or allow the Premises to be used for any unlawful or objectionable purpose.
- 26. When the parties entered into the Dollar General Lease, the Defendant did not market refrigerated and frozen groceries from the Premises, nor did it install refrigerator or freezer cases on the Premises.
- 27. Before the parties entered into the Dollar General Lease, Defendant did not disclose to Plaintiff any intention to market refrigerated or frozen food and groceries from the Premises, or to install refrigerator or freezer cases on the Premises.
- 28. On or about June, 2003, Defendant installed freezers and refrigerators on the Premises and began marketing refrigerated and frozen food and groceries.
- 29. On or about June, 2003, when the Defendant installed freezers and refrigerators on the Premises and began marketing refrigerated and frozen food and groceries, it interfered with and/or annoyed and/or obstructed the rights of another tenant; namely, Sterk's Super Foods.

- 30. Since on or about June, 2003 when the Defendant installed freezers and refrigerators on the Premises and began marketing refrigerated and frozen food and groceries, it allowed the Premises to be used for an unlawful and/or objectionable purpose.
- 31. On July 2, 2003, Plaintiff reminded Defendant that the Grocery Anchor, (i.e., Sterk's) had the exclusive right to operate a food supermarket; that the Dollar General Lease was conditioned on the existence of a grocery anchor on the Premises; that Defendant was now attempting to market refrigerated and frozen food and groceries in competition with Sterk's; that such activity violated the use provision of the Dollar General Lease; and that it should stop.
- 32. The Defendant agreed and emptied the freezers and refrigerators of the refrigerated and frozen foods for more than thirty days until it changed its position and deliberately resumed its actions.
- 33. On December 10, 2003, Defendant notified Plaintiff that it would not stop marketing refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises; that such items are "general merchandise" of the type sold at Dollar General® Stores today; that the use provision of the Dollar General Lease "does not restrict its application exclusively to the time of entering the lease"; and that "re-merchandising methods of doing business must be allowed to evolve over time in response to an ever-changing retail environment".
- 34. By letter dated March 8, 2004, Plaintiff notified Defendant that its continuing sale of refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises constituted a default of the Dollar General Lease and that under Article XVI thereof, Defendant was required to stop selling such items and remove coolers from the Premises within 30 days. A copy of the March 8, 2003 notice of default is attached as Exhibit "E".
 - 35. Defendant continues to sell refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the

Premises and thereby competes with Sterk's, the Grocery Anchor.

- 36. Plaintiff has performed its obligations under the Dollar General Lease.
- 37. Article XXIX(n) of the Dollar General Lease grants Plaintiff "a reasonable sum for attorneys' fees and other costs of suit" for "any action for any relief against Lessee, arising out of this Lease," including any suit arising out of "this Lease or Lessee's use or occupancy of the Premises."

COUNT I (Breach of Contract)

- 38. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1-37 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 39. The Dollar General Lease is a valid and enforceable contract between Plaintiff and Defendant.
 - 40. Plaintiff has fully performed its obligations under the Dollar General Lease.
- 41. Defendant has breached the Dollar General Lease by selling refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises.
- 42. Pursuant to Article XVI of the Lease, the Defendant is in default and has breached the lease by failing to stop selling refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises despite being instructed to do so.
 - 43. The breach by the Defendant has damaged the Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Honorable Court enter Judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

- 1. Termination of the Lease and the Defendant's right of possession to the Premises;
- 2. Awarding it losses and damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) which includes rent for the balance of the term and all

 $\mathbf{t}_{(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_r)}$

of the plaintiff's expenses of reletting including repairs, alterations, improvements, additions, decorations, legal fees and brokerage commissions pursuant to Article XVI, paragraph D;

- 3. Award it prejudgment interest and attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Article XXIX(n) of the Lease.
- 4. And for such other relief as this Court deems proper and appropriate.

COUNT II (Tortious Interference With Prospective Economic Advantage)

- 44. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates paragraphs 1-37 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 45. The Defendant has been aware since at least July, 2003 that the landlord and Sterk's had a business relationship governed by a lease which entitled the Grocery Anchor to the exclusive right to operate a food supermarket on the Premises.
- Anchor entitled the Grocery Anchor to the exclusive right to operate a food supermarket, the Defendant ignored the landlord's request to stop and continues to this day the marketing of refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises.
- 47. As a result of the Defendant's actions, the business relationship between the Plaintiff and Sterk's has been disrupted.
- 48. As a result of the Defendant's actions, the Plaintiff has suffered damages.

 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests this Honorable Court enter Judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:
 - 1. Termination of the Lease and the Defendant's right of possession to the Premises;
 - 2. Awarding it losses and damages in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) which includes rent for the balance of the term and all

of the plaintiff's expenses of reletting including repairs, alterations, improvements, additions, decorations, legal fees and brokerage commissions pursuant to Article XVI, paragraph D;

- 3. Award it prejudgment interest and attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Article XXIX(n) of the Lease.
- 4. And for such other relief as this Court deems proper and appropriate.

(Injunction)

- 49. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1-37 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 50. Defendant's use of the Premises to sell refrigerated and frozen food and groceries is a continuing and material breach of the Dollar General Lease and Defendant is in default thereof.
- 51. Article XVI(1)(D) of the Dollar General Lease provides that any default by Dollar General of "any term or condition thereof" may be "restrained or enforced by injunction" without limiting or waiving other legal and equitable remedies.
- 52. Plaintiff has a clear and identifiable right under the Dollar General Lease to ensure that Defendant does not sell refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises.
- 53. Plaintiff has been and will be irreparably harmed by Defendant's continuing use of the Premises to sell refrigerated and frozen food and groceries which interferes with the Grocery Anchor's exclusive use of the Premises for that purpose and thereby deprives Plaintiff of the benefits of the Grocery Lease.
- 54. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law to compensate it for Defendant's continuing sale of refrigerated and frozen food and groceries from the Premises.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order preliminarily and permanently enjoining the Defendant from selling refrigerated and frozen foods and

groceries at the Premises and requiring the Defendant to remove the refrigerators and freezers from the Premises and awarding it attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Article XXIV, paragraph n and for such other relief as this Court deems proper and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, LLC.

Of Its Attorneys

<u>VERIFICATION</u>

I, James E. Matanky, do hereby state that I have read the aforegoing Verified Complaint, by me subscribed; that the contents thereof are true and correct in substance and in fact, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Kames E. Matanky

Lee D. Sarkin, Esq. Matanky and Matanky, Ltd. Attorneys for Plaintiff 1332 N. Halsted St., Ste. 300 Chicago, IL 60622 (312) 337-6100

Attorney Code No.: 40247

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

No.

٧.

DOLGENCORP., INC., a Kentucky Corp.,

Defendant.

AFFIDAVIT OF MILTON SMITH

- I, Milton Smith, being first duly sworn upon oath, deposes and states as follows:
- 1. I, Milton Smith, am a Senior Real Estate Attorney with Dollar General Corporation, the parent company of Dolgencorp., Inc., a corporation that is incorporated under the laws of Kentucky and has its principal place of business in Tennessee. I was employed in this capacity with Dollar General Corporation at the time that the Summons and Complaint for the action entitled *Orchard Park Plaza*, *L.L.C.*, an Illinois limited liability company vs. Dolgencorp., Inc., Case Number 04 CH 08268 was filed, on May 24, 2004.
- 2. Dolgencorp., Inc. agrees to remove the above-referenced action from the Circuit Court of Cook County to the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
- 3. To the best of my personal knowledge of all of the foregoing facts are true, and I can competently testify thereto.

FURTHER, Affiant sayeth not.

Milton Smith, Senior Real Estate Attorney, Dolgencorp., Inc.

CHIDMS1/415159.1

My Commission Expires 12 - 02 - 2007

PUBLIC

#12 44 (KR4. 3/34)F	\bigcap	CIAIT COAFE			•
The IS-44 civil cover sheet by law, except as provided luse of the Clerk of Court for	and the informat	ontained herein neither re . This form, approved by ting the civil docket shee	place nor supplement the the ludicial Conference of the (SEE INSTRUCTIONS	and service of pleading the United States in Septem ON THE REVERSE OF T	s or other papers as required for ther 1974, is required for the FORM.)
PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN		•
ORCHARD PARK	PLAZA T. T.	C an Tilin	nia Doroma		
dimited liabil	ity company	·	Harding cons. 13	ORP., INC., A	Kentucky Cor
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff	Cook County,	IL Courty of Resid	mos of First Listed:	
, ,	CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTE			(DI U.S. PLAINTEF CASÉ	ONLY 2004
	04	4C 42	SHOTE RILLA	D CONDIGUENTION CASES, US INVOLVED.	ETHE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nume	, Address, and Telephon	is Number)	Attorneys (MKs	•	
Lee D. Sarkin, A	Matanky and	Matanky, Ltd	Baker 8	McKenzie	
1332 N. Halsted Chicago, IL 6062	22., Suite	337-6100	Chicago	Randolph St., LL 60601 (Suite 3500 <u>312) 861-2</u> 830
IL BASIS OF JURISDI				RINCIPAL PARTIES	Maco sa "X" in Con Box for Plai
	-		(For Diversity Cases Only):	· 	and One Box for Defendant)
Cl 1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Questice	· JUha	Citizen of This State 🔾	1 Ul incorporated or	PTF 0 Principal Place 12:4 (
Plaintiff		mant Not a Party)	ERO.	of Business in	This State
☐ 2 U.S. Government	E 4 Diversity	İ	CHEMIANN SHE C	2 [12 hoorporated and	Principal Place 🗓 5 🕠
Defendant	(Indicate Citis	zembig of Pertiply	"LU G/12	of Business is	Another State
		19/57	Attigue or Subject of a	A AGI 3 Poreles Notice	
TV NATION OF SIFE	(Piece as "X" in (Cone Box Only)	Total on Country	-	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		OK13	FORFETTURETTOOLTY	BANKRUPECY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Immer	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	G 610 Agriculture	1 422 Appent 28 USE 159	U 400 Sam Response
	3 10 Aipine 3 15 Aipine Proins	☐ 362 Pensoni Injury— Med. Majarastico	12 620 Other Pool & Drug	1 45 Whitensh	日 410 Antiquet. 日 430 James and Bunches
140 Negotiable Instrument	Links	365 Personal Injury — Product Liability	of Property 21 URC	24 (35) 1375	C 450 Communica/ICC Rates
& Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assemb, Libral & Standar	365 Asbestos Personali	G 640 R.R. & Trust	PROPERTY RIGHTS	1 470 Recketour indicated a
151 Mediums Act 15	330 Federal Burgloyees* Linking	Injury Product Liability:	GG Aidhe Rept.	C 200 Copyrights 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Corrupt Organizations 10 \$40 Selective Service
Student Louis	3 340 Marine 3 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPERTY	Safety/Metalific	S 340 Tradequels	[2] 850 Seturitier Compoditie Extense
153 Resovery of Overpayment	Liebility	13 371 Truth in Londing	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	CI 875 Cretoure Challenge 12 USC 3416
160 Stockholders' Seite	350 Motor Vehicle 353 Motor Vehicle	Property Demage	710 Pair Labor Steadards	C) 361 HBA (1393/83)	C 891 Agricultural Acts
190 Other Contract [35 Contract Product Linbilly C	Product Lieblilly 3 360 Other Personal Inc.	385 Property Demage Product Liability	Act	S42 Shork Lung (925)	392 Boonomic Stabilization 393 Saviyonmental Materia
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		C 864 SSED TIME XVI	2 894 Beargy Allicestion Ast 2 895 President of
	3 445 Voting	310 Motions to Vecate	(2) 730 Labor/Mans.Repuring & Disclamo Act		information Aut
220 Poreciosus	442 Employment 443 Honoing	Seutemen Habasa Corpute	1 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUTTS	Determination Under
240 Torte to Lend	Agocumodesione	S30 George	Cl 790 Other Labor Licigratus	G \$70 Texas (U.S. Pointiff or Defendant)	Equal Access to Junio 950 Countitationality of
	3 444 Welfare 3 440 Other Civil Rights	Ci 540 Mindreus & Other	C 791 Burpl, Ret. lot.	CI 471 DIS-Tribs Park	State Statemen 390 Other Statemeny Action
1		550 Civil Rights 555 Prince Condition	Security Act	26 USC 7109	
PLACE	AN 'X' IN ONE BO	XONLY)	<u> </u>		Appeal to District
V. ORIGIN			Reinstand or - 5 mothe	ferred from: r district	ipt C 7 Magistrate
	(Che de 110 Chill Che	Appellate Court the under which you are filter at	Reoperated (appear and write brief statement of curum,	A) City	Judement
VL CAUSE OF ACTION	Do not title jurisdiction	ni susuka wina diretily.)			
Removal pursuar		والمراكبة والمراكبة والمراجع			
VIL REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$150,00	, 0	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER P.R.C.F			JURY DEMAND	CI Yes Ø No
VIII. This case	not a refilling of a	previously disastesed			•
_	a refling of case	·	, previously dismi	med by Jadge	
DATE		SKENATURE OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD		
6/24/04		nia OV	<i>A</i>		

1-2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

In the Matter of

EASTERN DIVISION

ORCHARD PARK PLAZA, L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company, Plaintiff,

ca04C 4233

DOLGENCORP., INC., a Kentucky Corp.,

Defendant.

APPEARANCES ARE HEREBY FILED BY THE UNDERSIGNED AS ATTORNEY(S) FOR:

Defendant, DOL	GENC	CORP	., I	NC.,	a Kentucky Corp.		-11	-, .			
	- See yet ivy				e ze sauce	الله الله		100			
					JUDGE RONALD &	0	重	75 CS	У		
(A)					T HONALD AS	3) 55	-	200	7		
SIGNATURE LILIAM P. Kran	L										
NAME Hillary P. Krantz					NAME SIGNATURE JUDGE LEVIN SEE						
BAKER & MCKENZIE					FIRM TO THE TOTAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T						
130 E. Randolph St	., s	Suit	e 35	00	STREET ADDRESS						
Chicago, Illinois					CITY/STATE/ZIP						
TELEPHONE NUMBER 312/861-2952		1 MBER . 2 / 8 (61-2	899	TRIEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NU	MBER		,		
E-MAIL ADDRESS Hillary.P.Krantz@Ba	kern	et.	com		B-MAIL ADDRESS						
DENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6275302					IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEB ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)						
MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?	YES		МО	K	MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?	YES		ОИ			
TRIAL ATTORNEY?	YES	X	ИО	1	TRIAL ATTORNEY?	YES		ио			
the section					DESKINATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL?	YES		мо			
(C)					(D)						
SIGNATURE					SIGNATURE						
NAME					NAMB						
FIRM					FIRM						
STREET ADDRESS		-		<u>-</u>	STREET ADDRESS						
CITY/STATE/ZIP					CITYSTATECIP						
TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAXN	UMBER	·		TRLEPHONE NUMBER	PAX NU	MBER				
E-MAIL ADDRESS	·		·		E-MAIL ADDRESS						
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)					IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SER ITEM 4 ON REVE	(RSB)					
MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?	YES		NO		MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?	YES		ИО			
TRIAL ATTORNEY?	YES		МО		TRIAL ATTORNEY?	YES		МО			
DESIGNATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL?	YES		Ю		DESKINATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL?	YES		Ю			

